

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3438, REQUIRE EVALUATION BEFORE IMPLEMENTING EXECUTIVE WISHLISTS ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5719, EMPOWERING EMPLOYEES THROUGH STOCK OWNERSHIP ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 875 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 875

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3438) to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5719) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of certain equity grants. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as

amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 22, 2016, or September 23, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 875, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this rule forward on behalf of the Committee on Rules. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 3438, the Require Evaluation Before Implementing Executive Wishlists Act, or the REVIEW Act, and H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act.

For H.R. 3438, the rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and also provides for a motion to recommit. The rule also provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for H.R. 5719 and provides a motion, also, to recommit.

The rule makes in order two amendments to H.R. 3438, representing ideas from my colleagues across the aisle. Yesterday the Committee on Rules received testimony from the chairman and ranking member on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as testimony from Congressman ERIK PAULSEN and Congressman JOE CROWLEY from the Committee on Ways and Means.

The REVIEW Act, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

MARINO), went through regular order and enjoyed a thorough discussion at both the subcommittee and full committee level. In November of 2015, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform, Commercial and Antitrust Law, of which I am a member, held a legislative hearing on the bill. The bill was marked up by the Committee on the Judiciary on September 8, 2016. Several amendments were considered.

The Empowering Employees Through Stock Ownership Act also went through regular order. It was passed by voice vote through the Committee on Ways and Means on September 14. This bill, which has bipartisan support, would promote employee ownership at startup companies by addressing the tax treatment of restricted stock issued to employees.

Both bills represent good governance and provide relief for American workers and companies. The REVIEW Act is supported by numerous organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Associated Builders and Contractors, Forestry Resource Association, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and dozens more.

□ 1330

I am a proud cosponsor of this legislation because it ensures that American businesses won't have to waste billions of dollars if legally flawed new rules are thrown out by the courts. The bill is just plain common sense.

This legislation came about in response to a very real problem. In *Michigan v. EPA*, the court held that the EPA's Utility MACT rule was legally infirm because the EPA decided costs were irrelevant to its decision to promulgate the rule. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. Costs of implementing the rule were estimated to cost \$9.6 billion per year, with the intended goal of achieving benefits of only \$4 million to \$6 million per year.

It seems that something like this would not be true. Unfortunately, it is. The EPA issued a rule estimated to cost more than \$9 billion per year, even though the rule was expected to achieve benefits in airborne mercury emissions of \$4 million to \$6 million per year. The rule costs more than 10 times to implement than it brought in benefits.

Even away from the government perspective, there were questions concerning the actual other benefits as well. You wonder why people are angry at the Federal Government. Rules like this are a good example. Even worse, while the court found the rule legally infirm, it failed to set aside the rule which required businesses to continue to incur compliance costs, pending remand to the court of appeals.

This rule was not stayed by the courts during a multiyear legal battle

to challenge the rule, meaning the whole time the courts were deliberating, businesses were forced to start implementing the rule and bear the costs. This is a huge blow to businesses that had to pour time and money into compliance only to later be told it was a wasted effort because the legal challenge to the rule was ultimately successful.

To be sure, the successful legal challenge was a victory, but businesses shouldn't have had to go through years of uncertainty and billions of wasted dollars while the challenge was pending in the courts.

The REVIEW Act makes sense. It prevents needless expenditures like the ones businesses were forced to make while the Utility MACT case was winding its way through the courts.

You see, the fix is simple. The REVIEW Act requires that, when agencies promulgate new rules, the rules won't become legally effective until after the conclusion of litigation challenging them if the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs determines the rules would impose \$1 billion or more in costs to the economy. Litigants would have up to 60 days after the rule was published to bring litigation, unless specified otherwise by the particular law the agency rule pertains to.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker. We aren't talking about this kind of change for every rule. We are not talking about this kind of change even for every major rule. We are talking about making this commonsense amendment for rules that cost over \$1 billion to the economy.

Businesses shouldn't be forced to deal with these enormous compliance costs while it is unclear if the rule will ever even actually come to fruition. The time and money businesses are currently forced to spend complying with these rules is time and money taken away from building the businesses, investing in the community, and creating jobs.

Now, I will admit these billion-dollar rules have been issued by administrations of both parties in recent years. That is another reason why Members on both sides of the aisle should support this legislation.

According to the American Action Forum, in fact, from 2006 to 2008, the Nation averaged two of these rules annually; and from 2009 to present, the figure has actually increased to roughly three times per year. This increase in billion-dollar rules should be troubling to all of us, and businesses run by Republicans and Democrats are suffering from the effects of complying with these rules even as litigation is ongoing. Under this administration alone, these billion-dollar rules are estimated to have imposed total annual costs of \$65.1 billion. According to the American Action Forum, the related paperwork burden comes out to be about 19.5 million hours.

Since 2005, there have been at least 34 billion-dollar rules, with 24 of those

promulgated under the current administration. Thirty-four may not seem like a large number over the last 11 years, but we have to remember the extremely high cost of these results and the impact those costs can have on businesses and the economy.

There may be arguments from those on the other side that affected parties could receive a stay from the court during litigation, but stays are hard to obtain and the consequences of not obtaining one can be very costly.

During a Judiciary Committee hearing on the REVIEW Act, Paul Noe of the American Forest and Paper Association provided an enlightening example of the consequences of courts failing to issue stays as the billion-dollar rule goes forward.

He said in his testimony: "In 2007, about \$2 million in compliance investments were stranded in the paper and wood products industry when a court struck down the 2004 Boiler MACT rule just 3 months before the compliance deadline. When the rules were reissued in 2013, the new standards had changed significantly, and previous investments proved to be the wrong approaches to achieve compliance. Wasting limited capital undermines the competitiveness of U.S. businesses and impedes growth and job creation."

Mr. Noe's example is another real-life circumstance of the reason this bill, the REVIEW Act, is necessary. The last thing we should be doing is impeding growth and job creation. Instead, we should be looking to stimulate the economy and getting Americans working.

I know in northeast Georgia, many businesses are struggling due to the crushing costs of regulations. Many of these are small businesses that aren't able to employ attorneys and consultants to keep them up-to-date with the latest edicts from Washington. Instead, they are forced to spend time and resources figuring out how to deal with the onslaught of red tape; and that doesn't even take into account the massive burdens of these billion-dollar regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that not all regulation is bad. Regulations can help protect public health and safety and ensure needed worker protections; but regulation that does not make sense, regulation that has compliance costs that far exceed the benefits, simply doesn't make sense.

Importantly, in this bill, we aren't trying to prevent more regulation. We are simply saying that, for rules over a billion dollars, they shouldn't go into effect until litigation has concluded. That is common sense. Businesses shouldn't have to waste resources complying with a huge, new burden for something that might not ever even come into effect.

This is a narrowly written but important change to the Administrative Procedure Act that will prevent waste and, hopefully, encourage agencies to rethink issuing billion-dollar rules.

This is a bill that had plenty of hearing in the Judiciary Committee, both sides expressing their desires on these issues, and had full debate and markup.

Both the REVIEW Act and the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act are smart changes to current law that deserve full and fair consideration before this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to be in session for 7 days before yet another 6-week-long recess. Instead of addressing the most pressing issues facing our communities, we are on this floor with yet another Republican messaging bill to undermine the Federal rulemaking process.

With all that needs to be done, with all the crises we are facing, this is what they bring to the floor—a bill, by the way, that is not going anywhere. It is going nowhere. The President is going to send up a veto message. The Senate is not even going to take it up.

So what we are spending our time doing, what we are spinning our wheels about right now is something that, basically, I guess my friends can use in a press release, but this is not real legislating. And I get it. Attacking Federal regulations has become a favorite sound bite for my friends on the other side of the aisle. They are always quick to remind us of the costs associated with these regulations, but completely dismiss the very real and typically much larger benefits of protecting consumers, the environment, public health, and safety.

I am against duplicative regulation. I am against warrantless regulation or needless regulation. It would be nice if we could actually function in a bipartisan way to identify where we have common ground and where there is agreement so that we can make some progress, but that is not the MO of the Republican leadership in this House. It is their way or the highway.

H.R. 3438 automatically freezes any covered rule when any lawsuit is filed, regardless of how frivolous that lawsuit may be, instead of relying on the discretion and expertise of the courts.

Now, let's be honest with ourselves, Mr. Speaker. This isn't about good governance and it isn't about ensuring high-impact regulations pass legal muster. This is yet another election year giveaway to Republican special interests, and it is that time of year—lots of fundraisers, lots of political activity. People go home and say they voted for this bill that is going nowhere. Therefore, vote for them.

This is just yet another Republican effort to indefinitely delay regulations

that they don't like—regulations that protect consumers, regulations that protect public health and that protect our environment.

In fact, one of the most troubling aspects of this bill is that it fails to include any exceptions for rules responding to public health emergencies.

Can you believe that?

I am disappointed that the Republicans in the Judiciary Committee rejected Democratic amendments to the bill that would have ensured lawsuits could not tie up responses to public health emergencies.

Why would anybody be against that?

This is especially troubling as we face major health crises, like the Zika virus, and rely on our government to protect our public health. We should be doing everything in our power to find a solution to this terrible emergency, not passing legislation that can make finding that solution even harder.

I strongly oppose this misguided and unnecessary legislation, which does nothing to promote an efficient regulatory process, but delays regulations needed to protect our public health and safety.

This week the House is also set to consider H.R. 5719, the Empowering Employees through Stock Ownership Act. By allowing rank-and-file employees of private companies to defer payments on their stock options for 7 years, this bill makes it easier for these employees—often lower-income earners—to receive equity as part of their compensation.

Our economy is recovering, but not for everyone. More and more wealth is becoming concentrated in the top 1 percent and income inequality is at its highest levels since the Great Depression. Meanwhile, working families struggle to make ends meet, often needing several jobs just to get by.

So I support efforts to allow rank-and-file employees to truly share in the long-term success of their companies and our greater innovation economy. I think the majority of us share in that belief. But I do share the concerns that have been expressed by my Democratic colleagues during the Ways and Means Committee markup and in the Rules Committee last night that this bill isn't paid for and adds \$1.03 billion to the deficit. This bill not being paid for adds over a billion dollars to our deficit.

The Republican leadership in this House routinely refuses to bring up funding legislation that adequately addresses public health crises. They demand offsets anytime there is an emergency. When it comes to increases in our social safety net, we can't do it because we have to find offsets. But when it comes to tax breaks, there are no limits. They don't require offsets.

Just last week this House passed an unpaid-for tax cut that, if enacted, would add almost \$33 billion to the deficit. The Ways and Means Committee has marked up nearly \$54 billion worth of unpaid-for tax cuts just this year.

There was a time when caring about the deficit and the debt was something my Republican friends would talk about, but I guess that is no longer the case. So when my Republican friends talk about their commitment to fiscal responsibility, I have to ask: Why the double standard?

We can't help the people of Flint, Michigan, but we can pass tax breaks and tax cuts and not have to pay for them. By the way, the vast majority of tax cuts that my Republican friends support go to the wealthiest people in this country, not to the middle class.

We are told we have to fully offset emergency responses, as I said, to the water crisis in Flint, Michigan; the opioid epidemic; flooding disasters; and the growing threat of the Zika virus, but yet we don't have to pay for tax cuts. I just don't quite get it.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, my friends and colleagues, JOE CROWLEY and ANNA ESHOO, Democratic cosponsors of this bill, offered an amendment to offset the over \$1 billion cost by increasing a tax on oil barrels by two cents. That is just two cents that they would increase the cost. But what is important for people to remember is that what that means for the consumer is five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas.

□ 1345

So in order to offset something that we think is a good benefit, and to pay for it, it would cost consumers five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas. Most people that I talk to I don't believe think that that is an unreasonable thing, the choice between adding to the deficit, which, by the way, we all pay for anyway, or basically paying for things as we go. And so five one-thousandths of a penny on a gallon of gas, in order to offset the cost of this bill, I don't think, is unreasonable.

Now, this amendment was not made in order for consideration on the House floor because my Republican colleagues insisted that the offset was not germane to the bill.

But the House Rules Committee has the power to waive germaneness and other rules, and frequently does so, when it suits the needs of the majority. And during this Congress alone, Republicans on the Rules Committee have granted 245 waivers; 242, or 98 percent of them, have been for Republican initiatives. So they do it all the time when they want to.

So, Mr. Speaker, we had the ability to move the Crowley-Eshoo amendment to the floor for consideration, but Republicans in the Rules Committee blocked our efforts to responsibly pay for the costs associated with this change in tax law.

Now, I appreciate the work of my colleagues in promoting employee ownership among all of a company's workers, not just those at the top. But I do have some serious concerns about this majority's insistence that emergency re-

lief and other priorities be offset while tax cuts are able to sail through this House without a second thought and not be paid for. That is the wrong approach.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to make one comment, and then I think my friend from Massachusetts and I can look around. Nobody is beating our door down for time here.

There are no billion-dollar public health issues that were brought up that this—it doesn't waive for a billion-dollar public health emergency. In fact, probably if we did have over-a-billion-dollar health emergency, we could handle it better through statutory change than through a regulatory agency doing this. So it is an argument, but it is not a valid argument, I believe, in this case.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge my colleagues to vote to defeat the previous question, vote "no" on the previous question. And if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up the bipartisan no fly, no buy legislation that would allow the Attorney General to bar the sale of firearms and explosives to those on the FBI's terrorist watch list.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. There have been more than 10,000 gun-related deaths in this country this year alone. The country cannot tolerate the indifference on this issue any longer.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DONOVAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, we have only a few days left here before there is another recess, and we have incredible challenges before us. We have an opioid crisis in this country. We passed legislation that said all the right things, but the funding to fund all those nice things wasn't following.

We are confronted with a Zika virus crisis, and the American people are expecting us to do something, and this House has been twiddling its thumbs for far too long. The time for action is now.

We have a water crisis in Flint, Michigan; can't seem to get anything done in this House. Yet, those poor people can't drink the water out of their faucets and have been poisoned for years as a result of the indifference on that situation.

On the issue of gun violence, I mean, every day somebody gets killed in gun violence. We have tried to bring up a bill that would require universal background checks. I don't care what your position on guns is, I think we all should be able to agree that there ought to be universal background checks.

Right now, if you go into a licensed gun dealer, you have to go through a background check. But you get around that if you go to a gun show or buy a gun online.

I think everybody, I don't care what your philosophy is, should want to keep guns out of the hands of violent criminals and people who are dangerously mentally ill. I don't know why that is such a controversy in this House of Representatives. Yet, we can't even get the leadership to allow us to bring that bill to the floor.

On the issue that the previous question is about, which is the no fly, no buy list, I don't think there is anybody in this country who can understand why we think it is okay to, on one hand, say to somebody who is on an FBI terrorist watch list: we are concerned about you so much that you can't fly on an airplane. But, at the same time, say: well, okay, but you can go out and buy a gun; you can buy an assault weapon; and you can go out and buy a weapon of war.

That doesn't make any sense. People can't quite get why we can't come together on that. But even if you don't want to vote for that, you ought to let us have that debate and that vote.

These are the kinds of issues that we should be talking about. Yet, we are doing message bills that are going nowhere, again, not just because the President wants to veto them, it is because the Senate won't even take some of these things up.

So in these few days we have left, let's do something radical. Let's actually do the people's business. Let's do something that is going to help people in this country and improve their quality of life and protect them.

Mr. Speaker, again, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question and a "no" vote on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think we have made our case for the rule. I think it needs to be passed—also the underlying bills. I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 875 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to

a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's *Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question on House Resolution 875 will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting House Resolution 875, if ordered; ordering the previous question on House Resolution 876; adopting House Resolution 876, if ordered; and suspending the rules and passing the following bills: H.R. 3957, H.R. 5659, H.R. 5713, and H.R. 5613.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Clawson (FL)	Fleming
Aderholt	Coffman	Flores
Allen	Cole	Forbes
Amash	Collins (GA)	Fortenberry
Amodeli	Collins (NY)	Fox
Babin	Comstock	Franks (AZ)
Barletta	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Cook	Garrett
Barton	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Benishek	Cramer	Gibson
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gohmert
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Goodlatte
Black	Culberson	Gosar
Blackburn	Curbelo (FL)	Gowdy
Blum	Davidson	Granger
Bost	Davis, Rodney	Graves (GA)
Boustany	Denham	Graves (LA)
Brady (TX)	DeSantis	Graves (MO)
Brat	DesJarlais	Griffith
Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Brooks (AL)	Dold	Guinta
Buchanan	Donovan	Guthrie
Buck	Duffy	Hanna
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Hardy
Burgess	Duncan (TN)	Harper
Byrne	Ellmers (NC)	Harris
Calvert	Emmer (MN)	Hartzler
Carter (GA)	Farenthold	Heck (NV)
Carter (TX)	Fincher	Hensarling
Chabot	Fitzpatrick	Herrera Beutler
Chaffetz	Fleischmann	Hice, Jody B.

Hill
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers

McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell

Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier

Bishop (UT)
Brooks (IN)
Capuano
Clarke (NY)
Dent
Deutch
Farr
Garamendi

Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

NOT VOTING—23

Grijalva
Higgins
Larson (CT)
Marchant
Meehan
Moore
Neugebauer
Perlmutter

Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Poe (TX)
Rush
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schrader
Tiberi
Walters, Mimi

Guinta
Guthrie
Hanna
Hardy
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck (NV)
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Holding
Hudson
Huelskamp
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino

McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Pitts
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—171

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummins
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier

Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sarbanes
Schakowsky

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 239, noes 181, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—239

Abraham
Aberholt
Allen
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert

Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy

NOES—181

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny

Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Himes
Meng
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascrell

Payne	Sánchez, Linda	Titus
Pelosi	T.	Tonko
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Torres
Peters	Schakowsky	Tsongas
Peterson	Schiff	Van Hollen
Pingree	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Pocan	Scott, David	Veasey
Polis	Serrano	Vela
Price (NC)	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Quigley	Sherman	Visclosky
Rangel	Sires	Walz
Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Wasserman
Richmond	Smith (WA)	Schultz
Roybal-Allard	Speier	Waters, Maxine
Ruiz	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Ruppersberger	Takano	Welch
Ryan (OH)	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—11

Grijalva	Poe (TX)	Tiberi
Hill	Rush	Walters, Mimi
Lynch	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Moore	Schrader	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1420

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 525, had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5461, IRANIAN LEADERSHIP ASSET TRANSPARENCY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 876) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5461) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees on the estimated total assets under direct or indirect control by certain senior Iranian leaders and other figures, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 242, nays 181, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

YEAS—242

Abraham	Boustany	Coffman
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Cole
Allen	Brat	Collins (GA)
Amash	Bridenstine	Collins (NY)
Amodei	Brooks (AL)	Comstock
Babin	Brooks (IN)	Conaway
Barletta	Buchanan	Cook
Barr	Buck	Costello (PA)
Barton	Bucshon	Cramer
Benishek	Burgess	Crawford
Bilirakis	Byrne	Crenshaw
Bishop (MI)	Calvert	Culberson
Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)	Curbelo (FL)
Black	Carter (TX)	Davidson
Blackburn	Chabot	Davis, Rodney
Blum	Chaffetz	Denham
Bost	Clawson (FL)	Dent

DeSantis	Kelly (MS)	Ribble
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)
Diaz-Balart	King (IA)	Rigell
Dold	King (NY)	Roby
Donovan	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Duffy	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Duncan (SC)	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (TN)	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Ellmers (NC)	LaHood	Rokita
Emmer (MN)	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)
Farenthold	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Fincher	Lance	Roskam
Fitzpatrick	Latta	Ross
Fleischmann	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fleming	Long	Rouzer
Flores	Loudermilk	Royce
Forbes	Love	Russell
Fortenberry	Lucas	Salmon
Fox	Luetkemeyer	Sanford
Franks (AZ)	Lummis	Scalise
Frelinghuysen	MacArthur	Schweikert
Garrett	Marchant	Scott, Austin
Gibbs	Marino	Sensenbrenner
Gibson	Massie	Sessions
Gohmert	McCarthy	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McCaul	Shuster
Gosar	McClintock	Simpson
Gowdy	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Granger	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	McMorris	Smith (NJ)
Graves (LA)	Rodgers	Smith (TX)
Graves (MO)	McSally	Stefanik
Griffith	Meadows	Stewart
Grothman	Meehan	Stivers
Guinta	Messer	Stutzman
Guthrie	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Hanna	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Hardy	Miller (MI)	Tipton
Harper	Moolenaar	Trott
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Turner
Hartzler	Mullin	Upton
Heck (NV)	Mulvaney	Valadao
Hensarling	Murphy (PA)	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Neugebauer	Walberg
Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse	Walden
Hill	Noem	Walker
Holding	Nugent	Walorski
Hudson	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Huelskamp	Olson	Webster (FL)
Huizenga (MI)	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Hultgren	Palmer	Westerman
Hunter	Paulsen	Westmoreland
Hurd (TX)	Pearce	Williams
Hurt (VA)	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Issa	Pittenger	Wittman
Jenkins (KS)	Pitts	Womack
Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin	Woodall
Johnson (OH)	Pompeo	Yoder
Johnson, Sam	Posey	Yoho
Jolly	Price, Tom	Young (AK)
Jones	Ratcliffe	Young (IA)
Jordan	Reed	Young (IN)
Joyce	Reichert	Zeldin
Katko	Renacci	Zinke

NAYS—181

Adams	Cohen	Gallego
Aguilar	Connolly	Garamendi
Ashford	Conyers	Graham
Bass	Cooper	Grayson
Beatty	Costa	Green, Al
Becerra	Courtney	Green, Gene
Bera	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Beyer	Cuellar	Hahn
Bishop (GA)	Cummings	Hastings
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Heck (WA)
Bonamici	Davis, Danny	Higgins
Boyle, Brendan F.	DeFazio	Himes
Brady (PA)	DeGette	Hinojosa
Brown (FL)	Delaney	Honda
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro	Hoyer
	DeBene	Huffman
	Desaulnier	Israel
	Deutch	Jackson Lee
	Dingell	Jeffries
	Doggett	Johnson (GA)
	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson, E. B.
	Duckworth	Kaptur
	Edwards	Keating
	Ellison	Kelly (IL)
	Engel	Kennedy
	Eshoo	Kildee
	Esty	Kilmer
	Farr	Kind
	Foster	Kirkpatrick
	Frankel (FL)	Kuster
	Fudge	Langvin
	Gabbard	Larsen (WA)
		Larson (CT)

Lawrence	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Lee	Norcross	Sherman
Levin	O'Rourke	Sinema
Lewis	Pallone	Sires
Lieu, Ted	Pascarell	Slaughter
Lipinski	Payne	Smith (WA)
Loebach	Pelosi	Speier
Lofgren	Perlmutter	Swalwell (CA)
Lowenthal	Peters	Takano
Lowey	Peterson	Thompson (CA)
Lujan Grisham	Pingree	Thompson (MS)
(NM)	Pocan	
Luján, Ben Ray	Polis	Titus
(NM)	Price (NC)	Tonko
Lynch	Quigley	Torres
Maloney,	Rangel	Tsongas
Carolyn	Rice (NY)	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Richmond	Vargas
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Veasey
McCormack	Ruiz	Vela
McDermott	Ruppersberger	Velázquez
McGovern	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
McNerney	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walz
Meeks	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Meng	Schakowsky	Schultz
Moulton	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Murphy (FL)	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Nadler	Scott, David	Welch
Napolitano	Serrano	Wilson (FL)
Neal		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—8

Grijalva	Rush	Tiberi
Moore	Sanchez, Loretta	Walters, Mimi
Poe (TX)	Schrader	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1426

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 247, noes 174, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—247

Abraham	Chaffetz	Farenthold
Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Fincher
Allen	Coffman	Fitzpatrick
Amash	Cole	Fleischmann
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Fleming
Babin	Collins (NY)	Flores
Barletta	Comstock	Forbes
Barr	Conaway	Fortenberry
Barton	Cook	Fox
Benishek	Costa	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Cramer	Garrett
Bost	Crawford	Gibbs
Boustany	Crenshaw	Gibson
Brat	Culberson	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Bucshon	DeFazio	Granger
Burgess	Denham	Graves (GA)
Byrne	Dent	Graves (LA)
Calvert	Desantis	Graves (MO)
Carter (GA)	DesJarlais	Griffith
Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Grothman
Chabot	Dold	Guinta
Chaffetz	Donovan	Guthrie
Clawson (FL)	Duncan (SC)	Hanna
	Duncan (TN)	Hardy
	Ellmers (NC)	Harris
	Emmer (MN)	Hartzler